

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/589,539	08/16/2006	Klaus Abraham-Fuchs	32860-001074/US	8488	
30596 07862010 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O.BOX 8910			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			WINSTON III, EDWARD B		
RESTON, VA	20195		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3686		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/06/2010	ELECTRONIC	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dcmailroom@hdp.com siemensgroup@hdp.com pshaddin@hdp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/589,539	ABRAHAM-FUCHS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	EDWARD WINSTON	3686	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>15 June 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
---	---

- 1. \( \times \) The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
  - a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of detension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailting date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any searned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.70(4).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_ A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

## <u>AMENDMENTS</u>

- - appeal; and/or
  - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
- 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):

   Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
- 7. 
  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s); a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u>. Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-14</u>.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 OFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellat fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

## REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. \( \bigcap \) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- 12. Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_\_ 13. 

  Other:

Examiner, Art Unit 3686

/Jerry O'Connor/ SPE, GAU 3686 Continuation of 3. NOTE: The additional limitations being added raise new issues which would require material reconsideration of the previously cited references and/or additional searching for new references..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Office believes that the prior art of record used in the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection teaches each and every limitation of the claimed invention and that proper motivation exists for combining the prior art references and that, therefore, that a prima facie case for obviousness has been set forth in the previous Office Action.